<u>REMARKS</u>

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. Claims 15-19 are allowed. Applicant

gratefully acknowledges the indication of the allowance of Claims 15-19.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent

6,678,068 to <u>Richter et al.</u> (herein "<u>Richter</u>") in view of U.S. patent 5,805,166 to <u>Hall, Jr. et</u>

<u>al.</u> (herein "<u>Hall</u>").[1] That rejection is traversed by the present response, as discussed next.

Initially, applicant notes Claims 1 and 4 now clarify the plurality of different

individual distinct display components that are aligned in a successive progression from

image data reception to data printing successively indicate, "for a single print job," the

different processes from image data reception to data printing "that have been executed for

that single print job," and that are displayed simultaneously on a display portion. Those

claimed features are believed to be clear for example from Figure 2 in the present

specification.

The applicant of the present invention recognized that in the conventional art of

printing apparatus the status of print jobs has not always been displayed clearly enough so

that a user can be comfortable in determining, when a printing operation is being delayed,

whether the printing apparatus is merely taking a long time or a problem has occurred and

printing has been stopped.[2] Thus, one object of the present invention is to provide a printing

apparatus with enhanced displays so that a user can have a better understanding of the

progress of printing jobs. One manner in which the present invention achieves such an

objective is to include plural different display components successively indicating different

processes the image data of a single print job is undergoing at any given moment, and that

---

[1] The statement for the rejection on page 4 of the Office Action only indicates the rejection based on <u>Richter</u> in view of <u>Hall</u>. However, the body of the rejection also cites Cannon's Image Runner 500 Series User's Guide (herein the "<u>Cannon</u>" reference). It is unclear if the <u>Cannon</u> reference forms part of the rejection. Clarification is requested.
[2] See for example the present specification at page 3, lines 3-13.

can be simultaneously displayed on a display portion. As shown for example in Figure 2 in

the present specification the various display components 31-39 provide displays such as a

spooling indicator 31, a spool data display 36, a drawing indicator 33, a drawing page data

display 34, a saved job data display 35, a printed page data display 36, a printing indicator 37,

a supply/exit tray data indicator 38, and a message display 39, all as non-limiting examples of

different types of display components of the different processes the image data of a single

print job is undergoing at any moment, and that can be simultaneously displayed.[3] Several of

the dependent claims recite such individual display components.

The outstanding rejection is misconstruing <u>Hall</u> as <u>Hall</u> does not disclose or suggest

any display of a progression of processes from an image data reception to a data printing for a

single print job. As clearly shown in the relied upon Figures 2A-2H <u>Hall</u> discloses different

connections to a computer, but <u>Hall</u> does not disclose or suggest any operation from an image

data reception to a data printing for a single print job.

In fact applicants traverse the position that <u>Richter</u> and <u>Hall</u> are from the same field of

endeavor of displaying the status of peripheral devices.

<u>Richter</u> is directed to a client print server link that displays statuses applicable to

printers. <u>Hall</u> is not directed to any similar device. The only similarity between <u>Richter</u> and

<u>Hall</u> is that they both include displays, but what is being displayed is not at all related in

<u>Richter</u> and <u>Hall</u>. Clearly those references are not from the same field of endeavor.

Moreover, <u>Hall</u> simply does not even teach or suggest displaying a successive

progression of any operation. <u>Hall</u> clearly indicates status segments 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43,

and 45 can be part of a status window 30, but <u>Hall</u> indicates those segments provide a display

indicating if the corresponding element is ready or available or if an error has occurred

---

[3] See the present Specification at page 14, lines 3-9.

therein or if immediate attention is required.[4] Hall does not disclose or suggest that those

segments provide display components aligned in a successive progression, and clearly they

are not aligned in successive progression from image data reception to data printing, to

successively indicate, for a single print job, different processes that have been executed for

the single print job, and clearly they do not indicate the successive processes from image data

reception to data printing for the single print job. Instead Hall discloses segments 33, 35, 37,

39, 41, 43, and 45 provided for status indicators.

If the teachings in Hall were combined with the teachings in Richter that would at

most result in the device of Richter being modified to include different status indicators.

Such a combination of teachings still would not meet the claim limitations. That is, such a

combination of teachings still would not disclose or suggest:

> ...the display means comprising a plurality of different
> individual distinct display components aligned in a successive
> progression from image data reception to data printing to
> successively indicate, for a single print job, the different
> processes from image data reception to data printing that have
> been executed for the single print job, and that are displayed
> simultaneously on a display portion.

Further, the Canon reference merely discloses being able to list different jobs and

their statuses. The Canon reference is not at all directed to the claimed features, and does not

add anything to the teachings of Richter and Hall with respect to the claimed features.

In maintaining the outstanding rejection, the outstanding Office Action states:

> Particularly, Richter discloses displaying different processes
> that image data is undergoing at any given moment, as seen in
> Figs. 7-20 and 26-27, column 11 lines 46-58 and column 20
> line 36-column 21 line 13. Richter shows the ability to track a
> plurality of image data dynamically from reception to RIPping
> to spooling to printing and shows the status of a plurality of
> image data on a display simultaneously (Fig. 27). Thus,
> Richter discloses all the necessary elements that would allow a

---

[4] See the clear disclosure in Hall at column 5, lines 21-29 and column 5, lines 42-44.

user to obtain which different process the image data is
undergoing at any given moment.[5]

In responding to the above-noted statement for maintaining the rejection, applicant

notes for example in noted Figures 7-20 and 26-67 <u>Richter</u> does not disclose or suggest that

for a single print job individual distinct display components from image data reception to data

printing can be successively displayed simultaneously. The outstanding Office Action

appears to specifically cite Figure 27 in <u>Richter</u> to disclose tracking data dynamically from

reception to RIPping to spooling to printing, but in Figure 27 <u>Richter</u> merely discloses listing

individual print jobs under different procedures. <u>Richter</u> does not disclose or suggest that for

a single print job individual distinct display components are provided in succession from

image data reception to data printing. Thus, that basis for relying on the teachings of <u>Richter</u>

is traversed in view of the presently submitted claim amendments.

In further maintaining the outstanding rejection the outstanding Office Action states:

> However, Richter fails to disclose that individual distinct
> display components are aligned in a successive progression and
> that these components are displayed simultaneously. Hall
> discloses individual distinct display components are aligned in
> a successive progression and that these components are
> displayed simultaneously. Particularly, Hall discloses a
> plurality of icons with connection segments that display the
> status of the icons and the connection segments. The icons and
> connection segments are displayed <u>simultaneously</u> and are
> <u>individual distinct components aligned in a successive
> progression</u> to convey the status of the icons and the connection
> segments from a computer to an application database. Hall also
> states that the configuration of Figs. 2A-2H is an example of
> the invention and one possible use but acknowledges that
> modifications can be made to obtain the benefits of the
> invention (see column 11 lines 32-43). Therefore, it would
> have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time
> the invention was made to replace the icons shown in Hall with
> icons that represent image data reception, RIPping, spooling,
> print, etc., Richter shows the need to display the status of these
> processes, and dynamically and successively show the status of
> these processes in a manner similar to that disclosed by Hall.
> Richter and Hall are in fact from a similar field of endeavor as

---

[5] Office Action of July 17, 2007, page 2, penultimate line, to page 3, line 5.

both relate to displaying the status of processes taking place in an electronic environment.[6]

In responding to the above-noted grounds for rejection applicant reiterates Hall merely indicates different status segments 33-45 as part of a status window 30. Hall does not disclose or suggest such segments providing display components aligned in a successive progression from image data reception to data printing for a single print job to successively indicate for that single print job different processes that have been executed for the single print job.

Moreover, applicant again traverses the position that Richter and Hall are from a single field of endeavor "as they both relate to displaying the status of processes taking place in an electronic environment". What is being displayed in the systems of Richter and Hall are not at all believed to be remotely similar. Richter is directed to a client print server link that displays statuses applicable to printers. Hall is directed to a segmented status area in which a user *input* is acquired and icons are selectively displayed based on the user input.

The system of the present invention is directed to automatically providing a user with a status of a single print job from image data reception to data printing, and thus does not require a user input as in Hall to indicate the different statuses.

In view of the foregoing comments, applicant respectfully submits the claims as currently written clearly distinguish over Richter in view of Hall.

---

[6] Office Action of July 17, 2007, page 3, line 5, to page 6, line 2 (original emphasis).

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Surinder Sachar

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
SNS/rac

I:\ATTY\SNS\214892US-AM.DOC